THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES 1 2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT SEATTLE STEVE TEIXEIRA, 8 9 Plaintiff, 10 v. MOZILLA CORPORATION, a.k.a. M.F. Case No. 2:24-cv-01032-RAJ 11 Technologies, a California corporation; MOZILLA FOUNDATION, a California 12 DEFENDANT MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S public benefit corporation; LAURA FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, DEFENSES, CHAMBERS and her marital community; AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES 13 WINIFRED MITCHELL BAKER and her marital community; and DANI CHEHAK and 14 her marital community, 15 Defendants. 16 Defendant Mozilla Foundation answers Plaintiff Steve Teixeria's First Amended 17 Complaint as follows: 18 Plaintiff's Complaint commences with an introductory paragraph that attempts to 19 summarize his factual allegations and claims without a heading. Plaintiff employs the term 20 "Mozilla" without defining which defendant he contends engaged in the conduct set forth in the 21 introductory paragraph. Mozilla Foundation did not and denies the allegations to the extent they 22 intend to impugn Mozilla Foundation. As to other the Defendants, Mozilla Foundation lacks 23

DEFENDANT MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES – 1

Teixeira v. Mozilla Corporation, et al. – Case No. 2:24-cv-1032

24

1	knowledge or	information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Plaintiff's
2	introductory p	paragraph and therefore denies the same.
3		I. PARTIES
4	1.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
5	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 1, and therefore denies the same.
6	2.	Admit.
7	3.	Admit.
8	4.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
9	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 4, and therefore denies the same.
10	5.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
11	to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 5, and therefore denies the same.	
12	6.	Admit
13	7.	Admit.
14		II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE
15	8.	Paragraph 8 states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. Mozilla
16	Foundation at	ffirmatively alleges that the Federal District Court should exercise jurisdiction over
17	this matter.	
18	9.	Deny.
19	10.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
20	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 10, and therefore denies the same.
21	11.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
22	to the truth of	The allegations in Paragraph 11, and therefore denies the same.
23	12.	Admit.
24		
	i .	SEDDIC DILETO LAMES

DEFENDANT MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES – 3

Teixeira v. Mozilla Corporation, et al. – Case No. 2:24-cv-1032

to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 21, and therefore denies the same.

Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as

23

24

21.

- 34. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 34, and therefore denies the same.
- 35. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 35, and therefore denies the same.
- 36. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 36, and therefore denies the same.
- 37. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 37, and therefore denies the same.
- 38. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 38, and therefore denies the same.
- 39. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 39, and therefore denies the same.
- 40. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 40, and therefore denies the same.
- 41. Mozilla Foundation denies that it opened a new Seattle office in September 2023 as alleged in Paragraph 41.
- 42. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 42, and therefore denies the same.
- 43. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 43, and therefore denies the same.
- 44. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 44, and therefore denies the same.
- 45. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 45, and therefore denies the same.

- 94. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 94, and therefore denies the same.
- 95. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 95, and therefore denies the same.
- 96. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 96, and therefore denies the same.
- 97. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 97, and therefore denies the same.
- 98. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 98, and therefore denies the same.
- 99. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 99, and therefore denies the same.
- 100. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 100, and therefore denies the same.
- 101. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 101, and therefore denies the same.
- 102. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 102, and therefore denies the same.
- 103. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 103, and therefore denies the same.
- 104. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 104, and therefore denies the same.
- 105. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 105, and therefore denies the same.

- 106. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 106, and therefore denies the same.
- 107. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 107, and therefore denies the same.

IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

CLAIM ONE – WASHINGTON LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION (All Defendants)

- 108. Paragraph 108 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive pleading is required, and, to the extent it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these allegations as it previously answered herein.
- 109. Paragraph 109 of the Complaint contains only purported statements of law and no allegations of facts to which a responsive pleading is required. To the extent Paragraph 109 contains any allegations of fact, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
- 110. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 110, and therefore denies the same.
- 111. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 111, and therefore denies the same.
- 112. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 112, and therefore denies the same.
- 113. Paragraph 113 contains legal assertions that do not require a response. To the extent there are factual allegations requiring a response, Mozilla Foundation denies them.
- 114. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 114, and therefore denies the same.

22

1	115.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
2	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 115, and therefore denies the same.
3	116.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
4	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 116, and therefore denies the same.
5	117.	Deny.
6	118.	Deny.
7	119.	Deny.
8		CLAIM TWO – WLAD RETALIATION (All Defendants)
9	120.	Paragraph 120 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive
10	pleading is re	quired, and, to the extent it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these
11	allegations as i	t previously answered herein.
12	121.	Paragraph 121 of the Complaint contains only purported statements of law and no
13	allegations of	facts to which responsive pleading is required. To the extent Paragraph 121 contains
14	allegations of	fact, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
15	122.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
16	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 122, and therefore denies the same.
17	123.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
18 19	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 123, and therefore denies the same.
20	124.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
21	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 124, and therefore denies the same.
	125.	Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as
22	to the truth of	the allegations in Paragraph 125, and therefore denies the same.
23		
24		

24

- 126. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 126, and therefore denies the same.
- 127. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 127, and therefore denies the same.
- 128. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 128, and therefore denies the same.

CLAIM THREE – WLAD DISCLOSURE OF HEALTH INFORMATION (All Defendants)

- 129. Paragraph 129 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive pleading is required, and, to the extent it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these allegations as it previously answered herein.
- 130. Paragraph 130 of the Complaint contains only purported statements of law and no allegations of facts to which a responsive pleading is required. To the extent that Paragraph 130 contains any allegations of fact, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
- 131. Paragraph 131 of the Complaint contains only purported statements of law and no allegations of facts to which a responsive pleading is required. To the extent that Paragraph 131 contains any allegations of fact, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
- 132. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 132, and therefore denies the same.
- 133. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 133, and therefore denies the same.
- 134. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 134, and therefore denies the same.
 - 135. Deny.

- 136. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 136, and therefore denies the same.
- 137. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 137, and therefore denies the same.
- 138. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 138, and therefore denies the same.

CLAIM FOUR – FALSE LIGHT DEFAMATION (As to Defendant Mozilla Corporation)

- 139. Paragraph 139 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive pleading is required, and, to the extent it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these allegations as it previously answered herein.
- 140. The allegations in Paragraph 140 are not directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 140, and therefore denies the same.
- 141. The allegations in Paragraph 141 are not directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 141, and therefore denies the same.
- 142. The allegations in Paragraph 142 are not directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 142, and therefore denies the same.
 - 143. Deny.

CLAIM FIVE – VIOLATIONS OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (All Defendants)

1	144.	Paragraph 144 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive	
2	pleading is required, and, to the extent it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these		
3	allegations as it previously answered herein.		
4	145.	Deny.	
5	146.	Deny.	
6	CLAIM SIX – VIOLATIONS OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (All Defendants)		
7	147.	Paragraph 147 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive	
8	planding is re	equired, and to the extent that it does Mazilla Foundation admits and denies these	
9	pleading is required, and, to the extent that it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these		
10	allegations as it previously answered herein.		
	148.	Deny.	
11	149.	Mozilla lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth	
12	of the allegations in Paragraph 149, and therefore denies the same.		
13	150.	Deny.	
14		CLAIM SEVEN SHENCED NO MODE ACT	
15		CLAIM SEVEN – SILENCED NO MORE ACT (As to Defendant Mozilla Corporation)	
16	151.	Paragraph 151 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive	
17	pleading is required, and, to the extent that it does, Mozilla Foundation admits and denies these		
18	allegations as it previously answered herein.		
19	152.	The allegations in Paragraph 152 are not directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the	
20	extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief		
21	as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 152, and therefore denies the same.		
22	153.	The allegations in Paragraph 153 are not directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the	
23	extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief		
24	as to the truth	of the allegations in Paragraph 153, and therefore denies the same.	
	DEFENSES, A	MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES – 15 Sellevue, Washington 98007 Tilla Componition at al. Case No. 2:24 av. 1022	

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

CLAIM EIGHT – DECLATORY RELIEF (As to Defendant Mozilla Corporation)

- 154. Paragraph 154 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive pleading is required, and to the extent that it does, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
- 155. Paragraph 155 does not contain any factual allegations to which a responsive pleading is required, and to the extent that it does, Mozilla Foundation denies all of them.
- 156. Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 156, and therefore denies the same.
- 157. The allegations in Paragraph 157 are directed at Mozilla Foundation, but to the extent that they are, Mozilla Foundation lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 157, and therefore denies the same.

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Mozilla Foundation denies all remaining allegations in the Complaint that they have not yet separately and specifically admitted. Mozilla Foundation denies that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought in the Prayer for Relief.

VI. DEFENSES AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Plaintiff states no claim upon which relief may be granted, or for which any damages or fees sought may be awarded.
- 2. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by the applicable statute of limitations and/or doctrine of laches.
 - 3. Plaintiff was never an employee of Mozilla Foundation.
 - 4. Mozilla Foundation had no duty of care towards Plaintiff.
- 5. Mozilla Foundation had no knowledge of the alleged actions of Mozilla Corporation against Plaintiff.

1	6.	Plaintiff has not alleged any facts that, if proven, would pierce the corporate veil to
2		Foundation liable for Mozilla Corporation's alleged acts.
3	7.	Mozilla Foundation does not assume the liabilities of Mozilla Corporation.
4	8.	Plaintiff has unclean hands and/or waived his claims by his actions.
5	9.	Plaintiff is estopped by his own conduct from asserting the claims that he has
6	asserted.	
7	10.	Plaintiff's claims are frivolous and advanced without proper cause against Mozilla
8	Foundation.	
9	11.	Plaintiff has failed to mitigate his damages.
10	12.	Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because he did not suffer any
11	damages fron	n the acts and conduct of which he complains.
12	13.	Mozilla Foundation denies it caused any harm, injury, or damages to Plaintiff.
13	14.	Plaintiff's claims are barred and/or their damages, if any, are reduced in full or in
14	part, by the d	octrine of after-acquired evidence.
15	15.	Plaintiff would be unjustly enriched to recover damages from this action.
16	16.	Mozilla Foundation reserves a right to amend its Answer and assert additional
17	affirmative de	efenses and legal theories as established by the facts of the case.
18		VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF
19	Where	efore, having fully answered Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant Mozilla Foundation
20	requests the f	following relief:
21	(a)	for Plaintiff's Complaint to be dismissed with prejudice and at Plaintiff's sole cost;
22	(b)	for the Court to enter judgment in Defendant's favor on all claims in the
23	Complaint; as	nd
24		
	1	

1	(c) for the Court to award Defenda	ant such other relief that the Court determines is
2	equitable and warranted.	
3	DATED this 14th day of April 2025.	
4		SEBRIS BUSTO JAMES
5		s/ Darren A. Feider
6		Darren A. Feider, WSBA #22430 Beth Touschner, WSBA #41062
7		15375 SE 30 th Pl., STE 310 Bellevue, Washington 98007
8		(425) 454-4233 <u>dfeider@sbj.law</u> <u>btouschner@sbj.law</u>
9		btousemier(w/soj.iaw
10		Attorneys for Defendant Mozilla Foundation
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1

2	I, Darren A Feider, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that,		
3	on April 14, 2025 I caused to be served the attached document to the individuals listed below in		
4	the manner shown:		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff:		
6	Mathew L. Harington, WSBA #33276 Amy K. Alexander, WSBA #44242	☐ By U.S. Mail	
7	Maricarmen Perez-Vargas, WSBA #54344 Stokes Lawrence, P.S.	☐ By Federal Express☐ By Facsimile	
8	1420 5 th Avenue, 30 th Floor Seattle, WA 98101	☐ By Messenger☒ By Electronic Mail	
9	Phone: (206) 626-6000 Fax: (206) 464-1496	☐ By E-service	
10	Mathew.harrington@stokeslaw.com Amy.alexander@stokeslaw.com		
11	Maricarmen.Perez-Vargas@stokeslaw.com		
12	Attorneys for Defendants Mozilla Corporation,	□ By U.S. Mail	
13	Laura Chambers, and Dani Chehak	☐ By Federal Express	
14	Anthony Todaro, WSBA #30391 Alexandria Cates, WSBA #53786	□ By Facsimile□ By Messenger	
15	DLA Piper LLP (US) 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6900	☑ By Electronic Mail☐ By E-service	
16	Seattle, WA 98104 Phone: (206) 839-4800	•	
17	Fax: (206) 839-4801		
18	Anthony.todaro@us.dlapiper.com Alexandria.cates@us.dlapiper.com		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

DEFENDANT MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES – 19
Teixeira v. Mozilla Corporation, et al. – Case No. 2:24-cv-1032

1	Attorney for Defendant Winifred Mitchell Baker	☐ By U.S. Mail
2	Daniel M. Weiskopf, WSBA # 44941 MCNAUL EBEL NAWROT & HELGREN	☐ By Federal Express ☐ By Facsimile
3	PLLC 600 University Street, Suite 2700	☐ By Messenger ☑ By Electronic Mail
4	Seattle, Washington 98101 Phone: (206) 467-1816	☐ By E-service
5	dweiskopf@mcnaul.com TDo@mcnaul.com	
6	1DO(W)MCHaufi.com	
7		
8		
9		s/ Darren A. Feider Attorney for Defendant Mozilla Foundation
10		Actionney for Berendant Wozina Foundation
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

DEFENDANT MOZILLA FOUNDATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES – 20
Teixeira v. Mozilla Corporation, et al. – Case No. 2:24-cv-1032